



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/188,492	11/09/1998	SEONGHO BAE	33012-250-10	4421

7590 02/02/2004

CHARLES A JOHNSON
UNISYS CORPORATION
P O BOX 64942
MS 4772
ST PAUL, MN 55164

EXAMINER

WASSUM, LUKE S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 02/02/2004

23

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/188,492

Applicant(s)

BAE, SEONGHO

Examiner

Luke S. Wassum

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Applicant's amendment, filed 10 October 2003, has been received, entered into the record and considered.

2. As a result of the amendment, claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the application.

The Invention

3. The claimed invention is a data processing environment that supports the generation of reports on a periodic basis, and the delivery of said reports electronically to a user over the Internet.

Drawings

4. The Applicant's formal corrected drawings, filed 10 October 2003, have been received and approved.

Specification

5. In view of the amendment to the specification, the examiner withdraws all pending objections to the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Remington et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,070,150).

8. Regarding claim 1, **Remington et al.** teaches a data processing environment as claimed, comprising:

- a) a user terminal which generates a service request and displays a report coupled to a publicly accessible digital communications network (see consumer 114 and network 116 in Figure 4; see also discussion of the "registration stage when the consumer initially signs up for the service", col. 15, lines 5-10, analogous to the claimed service request; see additionally the execution of a "change of address" request, col. 12, lines 8-17);
- b) a database management system which generates said report (see col. 9, lines 7-58, and col. 10, lines 33-42, teaching the detailed information in the formatted bills, a teaching which renders the existence of a database management system inherent in the system; see also col. 7, lines 50-53);

- c) a software controlled server (see biller computing unit 112 in Figure 4) responsively coupled to said user terminal (see consumer 114 in Figure 4) via a publicly accessible digital communications network (see network 116 in Figure 4) and responsively coupled to said database management system (see col. 9, lines 7-58, and col. 10, lines 33-42, teaching the detailed information in the formatted bills, a teaching which renders the existence of a database management system inherent in the system) which receives said service request and forwards it to said database management system for honoring (see discussion of the "registration stage when the consumer initially signs up for the service", col. 15, lines 5-10, analogous to the claimed service request; see additionally the execution of a "change of address" request, col. 12, lines 8-17);
- d) an administration module which automatically determines a time to generate said report (see discussion of the initiation of the billing process, col. 15, line 67 through col. 16, line 1; see also col. 15, lines 35-43; see also disclosure of the prior art periodic generation of bills, col. 1, lines 28-32);
- e) a software object responsively coupled to said database management system and said administration module which executes a plurality of command script statements to generate said report in response to a signal from said administration module (see discussion of billing statement generation, col. 7, lines 50-54); and
- f) a storage facility wherein said server spools said report for future delivery to said user terminal (see discussion of the embodiment wherein the customer receives a notification to check a billing mailbox to retrieve electronic bills, col. 8, lines 17-22; see also discussion of the use of HTML in generating bills, col. 12, lines 24-60; see

also discussion of sending the generated bills to an intermediary for future delivery to the customer, col. 16, lines 14-43, and particularly lines 35-43).

9. Regarding claim 6, Remington et al. teaches an apparatus as claimed, comprising:
- a) a user terminal which displays a report (see consumer 114 in Figure 4);
 - b) a publicly accessible digital communications network coupled to said user terminal (see network 116 in Figure 4);
 - c) a software controlled server responsively coupled to said user terminal via said publicly accessible digital communications network (see biller computing unit 112 in Figure 4);
 - d) a database management system which automatically generates said report by executing a sequence of command script statements in response to a predetermined signal not initiated by said user terminal responsively coupled to said server (see col. 9, lines 7-58, and col. 10, lines 33-42, teaching the detailed information in the formatted bills, a teaching which renders the existence of a database management system inherent in the system; see also discussion of billing statement generation, col. 7, lines 50-54);
 - e) an administration module within said server which spools said report for later electronic delivery to said user terminal at a future time (see discussion of the embodiment wherein the customer receives a notification to check a billing mailbox to retrieve electronic bills, col. 8, lines 17-22; see also discussion of sending the generated bills to an intermediary for future delivery to the customer, col. 16, lines 14-43, and particularly lines 35-43).

10. Regarding claim 11, **Remington et al.** teaches a method of communicating between a user terminal and a database management system as claimed, comprising:

- a) automatically generating a report by said database management system through execution of a series of command script statements in response to a sensed signal at a first predetermined time determined by an administration module (see col. 9, lines 7-58, and col. 10, lines 33-42, teaching the detailed information in the formatted bills, a teaching which renders the existence of a database management system inherent in the system; see also discussion of billing statement generation, col. 7, lines 50-54; see also discussion of the initiation of the billing process, col. 15, line 67 through col. 16, line 1; see also col. 15, lines 35-43; see also disclosure of the prior art periodic generation of bills, col. 1, lines 28-32);
- b) converting said report into a display page (see discussion of the use of HTML in generating bills, col. 12, lines 24-60);
- c) spooling said display page within a repository (see discussion of the embodiment wherein the customer receives a notification to check a billing mailbox to retrieve electronic bills, col. 8, lines 17-22; see also discussion of sending the generated bills to an intermediary for future delivery to the customer, col. 16, lines 14-43, and particularly lines 35-43);
- d) making a service request from said user terminal to said database management system (see discussion of the "registration stage when the consumer initially signs up for the service", col. 15, lines 5-10, analogous to the claimed service request; see additionally the execution of a "change of address" request, col. 12, lines 8-17); and

- e) transmitting said display page from said database management system to said user terminal at a future time (see discussion of the embodiment wherein the customer receives a notification to check a billing mailbox to retrieve electronic bills, col. 8, lines 17-22; see also discussion of sending the generated bills to an intermediary for future delivery to the customer, col. 16, lines 14-43, and particularly lines 35-43).
11. Regarding claim 16, **Remington et al.** teaches an apparatus as claimed, comprising:
- a) means for permitting a user to interact with a digital database by making a service request and for displaying a report (see consumer 114 in Figure 4);
 - b) means responsively coupled to said permitting means for providing said user with access to a publicly accessible digital communications network (see network port 170 in Figure 6; see also network 116 in Figure 4);
 - c) means responsively coupled to said permitting means for generating a report at a first predetermined time by executing a sequence of command script statements (see col. 9, lines 7-58, and col. 10, lines 33-42, teaching the detailed information in the formatted bills, a teaching which renders the existence of a database management system inherent in the system; see also discussion of billing statement generation, col. 7, lines 50-54; see also discussion of the initiation of the billing process, col. 15, line 67 through col. 16, line 1; see also col. 15, lines 35-43; see also disclosure of the prior art periodic generation of bills, col. 1, lines 28-32); and
 - d) means responsively coupled to said generating means and said permitting means for spooling said report for delivery at a future time to said permitting means (see discussion of the embodiment wherein the customer receives a notification to check a

Art Unit: 2177

billing mailbox to retrieve electronic bills, col. 8, lines 17-22; see also discussion of sending the generated bills to an intermediary for future delivery to the customer, col. 16, lines 14-43, and particularly lines 35-43).

12. Regarding claim 2, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an improvement further comprising a plurality of user terminals which display said report and wherein said software controlled server electronically delivers said report to said plurality of terminals (see disclosure that prior art systems distributed bills to a plurality of customers, col. 1, line 64 through col. 2, line 44; see also disclosure that the bill is transmitted to a plurality of users, col. 16, lines 14-42, and particularly lines 36-38).

13. Regarding claim 3, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an improvement wherein said publicly accessible digital communications network is the World Wide Web (see col. 7, lines 19-27).

14. Regarding claim 4, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an improvement wherein said storage facility further comprises a repository wherein said repository includes space for storage of said report in final form (see disclosure that bills, analogous to the claimed report, are kept in a "billing mailbox", analogous to the claimed repository, col. 8, lines 17-22; see also disclosure that the billing information is stored at an intermediary, analogous to the claimed repository, col. 16, lines 14-42).

15. Regarding claim 7, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus further comprising a plurality of user terminals which display said report (see disclosure that prior art systems distributed

Art Unit: 2177

bills to a plurality of customers, col. 1, line 64 through col. 2, line 44; see also disclosure that the bill is transmitted to a plurality of users, col. 16, lines 14-42, and particularly lines 36-38).

16. Regarding claim 8, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus further comprising a repository located within said server for storing said report in final form for later electronic delivery to said plurality of users (see disclosure that bills, analogous to the claimed report, are kept in a "billing mailbox", analogous to the claimed repository, col. 8, lines 17-22).

17. Regarding claim 9, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital communications network is the World Wide Web (see col. 7, lines 19-27).

18. Regarding claim 10, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said user terminal is an industry compatible personal computer having a web browser (see disclosure of an industry standard personal computer at col. 8, line 33 through col. 9, line 6; see disclosure of the use of a web browser at col. 12, lines 23-33).

19. Regarding claim 12, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein said user terminal comprises an industry compatible personal computer (see disclosure of an industry standard personal computer at col. 8, line 33 through col. 9, line 6).

20. Regarding claim 13, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches a method further comprising a plurality of user terminals (see disclosure that prior art systems distributed bills to a plurality of

Art Unit: 2177

customers, col. 1, line 64 through col. 2, line 44; see also disclosure that the bill is transmitted to a plurality of users, col. 16, lines 14-42, and particularly lines 36-38).

21. Regarding claim 14, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches a method wherein said transmitting step further comprises transmitting over the World Wide Web (see col. 7, lines 19-27).

22. Regarding claim 17, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said publicly accessible digital communication network further comprises the World Wide Web (see col. 7, lines 19-27).

23. Regarding claim 18, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said generating means further comprises means for storing said report in final form (see disclosure that bills, analogous to the claimed report, are kept in a "billing mailbox", analogous to the claimed means for storing, col. 8, lines 17-22; see also disclosure that the billing information is stored at an intermediary, analogous to the claimed means for storing, col. 16, lines 14-42).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

24. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2177

25. Claims 5, 15, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Remington et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,070,150) as applied to claims 1-4, 6-14 and 16-18 above, and further in view of **Admission** (Admitted Prior Art).

26. Regarding claims 5, 15 and 19, **Remington et al.** teaches a data processing environment, method and apparatus substantially as claimed.

Remington et al. does not explicitly teach a data processing environment, method and apparatus wherein said database management system is CLASSIC MAPPER.

Admission, however, teaches the CLASSIC MAPPER database management system (see applicant's specification [as amended], page 4, lines 7-13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate the CLASSIC MAPPER database management system, since it is admitted as prior art that CLASSIC MAPPER is one of the most successful database management systems (see page 4, lines 9-12).

Furthermore, demonstrated commercial success implies that the product has features that are advantageous over competing products. (else why would people buy it?) Additionally, the desire to make one's system compatible with others would additionally provide motivation for one to choose a database management product that has a wide commercial success, since this necessarily means that many other systems also employ the same database management product, and thus compatibility with other systems is enhanced

27. Regarding claim 20, **Remington et al.** additionally teaches an apparatus wherein said permitting means is an industry compatible personal computer (see disclosure of an industry standard personal computer at col. 8, line 33 through col. 9, line 6).

Response to Arguments

28. Applicant's arguments filed 10 October 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

29. Regarding the Applicant's argument that the **Remington et al.** reference fails to teach a user terminal that generates a service request, the examiner respectfully points out that the claimed user terminal is taught at col. 7, lines 13-19, and illustrated as consumer 114 in Figure 4, and all of Figure 6. The claimed service request is taught at col. 15, lines 5-10, including a discussion of the "registration stage when the consumer initially signs up for the service", analogous to the claimed service request; see additionally the execution of a "change of address" request, col. 12, lines 8-17.

30. Regarding the Applicant's argument that the examiner has read consumer 114 as both the user terminal and the database management system, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The reasoning behind the Applicant's argument is that the disclosures cited are made with reference to Figures 6-8, and since those drawing figures are concerned with the consumer computer, then the examiner must be reading the consumer computer as the database management system.

A simple reading of the rejection of record should serve to illustrate that the examiner has used the data present in the billing statement to make the case that the database management system is inherent in the biller system. At col. 7, lines 50-53, it is disclosed that the biller's software generates a bill and associated payment remittance information. Given the volume and complexity of the data involved in billing, the biller's software to generate the bill must inherently include a database management system.

31. Regarding the Applicant's argument that the **Remington et al.** reference fails to teach a single report being displayed at a plurality of user terminals, the examiner respectfully refers the Applicant to the cited portion of the reference (col. 16, lines 14-42, and particularly lines 36-38), wherein **Remington et al.** teaches that bill 128 is transferred to the appropriate customers at the prescribed billing times. Possible reasons for transferring the same bill to multiple customers might include a corporate credit account, wherein copies of the bill are sent to the corporation and the individual card carrier.

32. Regarding the Applicant's argument that the **Remington et al.** reference fails to teach the storage of said report in final form, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The rejection of record cites portions of the reference that teach facilities that store the bills, such as a billing mailbox (col. 8, lines 17-22) or centralized bill warehouse (col. 16, lines 14-42, and particularly lines 22-25). In neither embodiment is there any teaching of modification of the bill between the storage facility and the transmission of the bill to the customer. In the absence of clear indication or suggestion of such a modification/restructuring of the bill, the plain interpretation of the disclosure must be that the bills are stored in their 'final form' as claimed.

33. Regarding the Applicant's arguments that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to attempt the combination of Classic MAPPER with the system of Remington et al., the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The Applicant uses as support for his arguments various teachings in the specification of the limitations of the Classic MAPPER database management system. However, the examiner believes that the Classic MAPPER database management system that was available at the time of the invention was not saddled with these limitations. In support, the examiner submits descriptions of the MAPPER system that were posted on the Unisys web site as of 26 May 1997. The system is characterized as "an open, enterprise-wide, client/server environment". This is in stark contrast with the limited proprietary system that is portrayed in the Applicant's arguments.

Given these facts, the examiner believes that it would indeed have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the MAPPER database management system, in contrast with the Applicant's arguments, and maintains the rejection of record.

Conclusion

34. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Unisys ("Unisys CSG MarketPlace – The Mapper System") teaches the advantages of the Mapper system, an open, enterprise-wide client/server environment.

35. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2177

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2177


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luke S. Wassum whose telephone number is 703-305-5706. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30, alternate Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.


In addition, INFORMAL or DRAFT communications may be faxed directly to the examiner at 703-746-5658.

Customer Service for Tech Center 2100 can be reached during regular business hours at (703) 306-5631, or fax (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


Luke S. Wassum
Art Unit 2177

lsw
26 January 2004


JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100